

**REMARKS**

Claims 22-29 were, as set forth in paragraph 3, rejected as being obvious from a combination of Elkind, Linder, Segal and Ilsen. Elkind is the primary reference. Linder is relied upon as disclosing an IMD patient associated database. Setal is relied upon as disclosing a patient lab records database. Ilsen is relied upon as disclosing a patient customized web page.

The office action acknowledges that the Elkind, Linder and Segal do not disclose a customized web page. The office action contends that Ilsen provides such a feature and references col. 33, lines 20-24. However, in the cited passage, all that is disclosed is that a patient can go to a web site and log-in for access to the patient's "customized content over a secure Internet connection." This disclosure is not of a customized web page.

To more clearly distinguish over Ilsen, claim 22 has been amended to specify a patient welcome interface including a web page automatically assembled and presented for display as a viewable object upon user verification, *wherein the web page is assembled from objects customized to an individual implantable medical device patient*. The disclosure of Ilsen cannot validly be characterized as a web page assembled from objects customized to an individual patient. The mere "content" of Ilsen combined along with Elkind, Linder and Segal fails to provide the subject matter, as a whole of amended claim 22.

Accordingly, the rejection of the claims as being obvious from the combination of Elkind, Linder, Segal and Ilsen is without basis and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2007

/Daniel G. Chapik/  
Daniel G. Chapik  
Reg. 43,424  
Telephone: (763) 514-3066  
Customer No. 27581